DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 124 549 SP 010 185

AUTHOR Curran, John
TITLE An Analysis of the Opinions of Thirteen Client Groups Concerning the Harrison County Teacher Education Center.
PUB DATE Apr 76
NOTE 26p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Coordination; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Interinstitutional Cooperation; Professional Continuing Education; Surveys; *Teacher Centers; Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS West Virginia

ABSTRACT

This study is an analysis of the opinions of 13 client groups concerning the Harrison County Teacher Education Center (HCTEC) and is a sequel to a previous study. This study concentrated on two major questions: (1) what are the opinions of 13 client groups about the perceived needs for the HCTEC; and (2) how do these client groups differ in their opinions of the needs of the HCTEC. The data was obtained from the answers to 34 questions given by the 13 client groups in the previous study. The Fisher Least Significant Difference Formula was used to analyze the data. The results of this study revealed that the existence of a center to perform a wide variety of important functions in Harrison County's educational structure elicited a strong, positive reaction from all groups surveyed. Further, there was a strong homogeneity among all groups, indicating unanimity of opinion. The most notable exception to this pattern were college supervisors. Those functions of a teacher center that elicited the highest and the lowest homogeneity are given. The author recommends that a larger, more comprehensive study be done, preferably one involving all seven centers in the state of West Virginia. Tables are included. Appended are the survey instrument used and a list of terms and their definitions. (RC)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED124549

AN ANALYSIS OF THE OPINIONS OF THIRTEEN CLIENT GROUPS CONCERNING THE HARRISON COUNTY TEACHER EDUCATION CENTER

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

By

John Curran

April 1976

SP010 185

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

ANALYSIS OF DATA 3

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 10

APPENDIX A 12

APPENDIX B 17

INTRODUCTION

This paper is designed to serve as a sequel to a study completed in 1975 by Hubert H. Gainer. This study was entitled "The Harrison County Teacher Education Center as Perceived by Thirteen Client Groups".

The Gainer paper focused on 34 questions which were answered by the members of 13 client groups served by the Harrison County Teacher Education Center. The emphasis was on the analysis of F-test and t-test data on the mean scores of the various groups for each of the 34 questions.

A complete profile of the entire project from the design of the assessment instrument to the final conclusions drawn can be found in the Gainer report. Thus this paper will not make extensive comments on the subject of project structure and design.

Briefly stated, the report was an initial attempt by the Harrison County Teacher Education Center to carry out a mandate to all West Virginia teacher education centers by their supervising agency, the West Virginia State Department of Education. The mandate called for an in-depth needs assessment covering all client groups served in order to determine the direction center programs should take.

The Harrison County Teacher Education Center was initiated in 1971 and is one of seven such centers in West Virginia. Since its inception the center has had a positive impact on all facets of teacher education in north central West Virginia.

It serves the Harrison County public school system, which enrolls over 16000 students and employs nearly 750 teachers. The center is multi-institutional in nature, serving and drawing resources from six colleges and universities. These institutions are: Alderson-Broaddus, Davis and Elkins, Fairmont State, Salem and West Virginia Wesleyan colleges, and West Virginia University.

This project amplifies the Gainer study by utilizing the same data with a different emphasis. It concentrates on two major questions:

1. What are the opinions of 13 client groups about the perceived needs for the HCTEC?
2. How do these client groups differ in their opinions of the needs of the HCTEC?

As stated, the focus of the Gainer paper was on F-test and t-test data performed on the client groups' mean scores. This paper employs the Fisher Least Significant Difference (LSD) Formula, applying it to those same mean scores. Analysis of data is performed from this viewpoint.

The hope is that these two projects can serve as an initiatory step to a larger design which will culminate in the regular, systematic application of an improved needs assessment for all client groups in this and all other teacher education centers in West Virginia. Steps have been taken to set this process in motion.

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Each question was scored by each respondent on a 5-4-3-2-1 scale, with 5 being the highest rating. Each question was prefaced by the statement "A center should···", meaning that 3.00 is essentially the "neutral" point in terms of the respondent group's perceived need.

The first of the two research questions this paper deals with asks "What are the opinions of the 13 client groups about the perceived needs for the Harrison County Teacher Education Center?"

A look at the group mean scores reveals that all 34 questions scored a positive overall mean, ie over 3.00. In fact, all but three of the 34 composite means were not only over 3.00, but were actually over 4.00. The implication is that all groups felt a strong need for an organization such as a teacher education center to carry out a large number of apparently badly needed functions.

The three lowest overall means were still well up in the positive range, at 3.74, 3.82 and 3.97. They were compiled as follows:

Question 12: "···provide prospective teachers with the opportunity to participate in a wide variety of clinical enrichment experiences in community agencies". 3.74

Question 11: "···encourage an interchange of personnel between colleges and public schools, such as joint appointments and internships". 3.82

Question 22: "···assist in the development and initiation of new and changing roles for teachers and college personnel in teacher education, such as school-based teacher education coordinators". 3.97

On the other hand, the highest means were found as follows, beginning at a high of 4.52.

Question 10: "...continuous program evaluation to facilitate desireable change". 4.52

Question 15: "...encourage cooperating teachers and student teachers to plan, teach, evaluate together as a team". 4.46

Question 29: "...conduct inservice programs which help teacher educators keep abreast of current trends in teacher education". 4.46

Question 24: "...promote mutual trust and confidence between colleges and public schools". 4.44

Question 21: "...select cooperating teachers who will accept their student teachers as professional colleagues". 4.43

Three other questions scored well. They involved providing inservice education for cooperating teachers, making available selected teacher education resource materials, and promoting a partnership philosophy between colleges and public schools in teacher education.

An examination of the 34 x 13 or 442 individual group means again reveals an overwhelming majority of positive responses. A total of 419 scores were over 3.00, 11 were exactly 3.00 and only 12 were negative, ie under 3.00.

It is interesting to examine the groups which compiled the 23 lowest means. Group three, college supervisors, had five neutral and six negative means, or 11 of the 23 total. Two other groups tied with five "non-positive" means. These were group five, central office supervisors and group nine, community members. This gave those three groups 21 of the total 23 low mean scores.

Four groups are of vital interest to any teacher education center. They are: student teachers (2); college supervisors (3); center governance board (12); supervising teachers (13).

This data found members of group 12, the center governance board, scoring highest overall. All 34 of this group's means were over 4.00, and 25 of them were over 4.50. This appears significant since many governance board members are college faculty representatives, and the responses of group 13, college supervisors, contrasted starkly with those of the governance board. The college supervisors scored lowest overall, with six means under 3.00, 20 under 4.00, and only five over 4.50.

Student teachers and supervising teachers scored very similar totals. Each had only six questions under 4.00.

A "mean of the means", ie overall mean, was calculated for each separate group. They were as follows:

Group 12:	4.56	(Center Governance Board)
Group 2:	4.33	(Student Teachers)
Group 13:	4.20	(Supervising Teachers)
Group 3:	3.64	(College Supervisors)

Once again all scores were well within the positive range, indicating a favorable perception toward the center's performance of all 34 functions. This trend held true throughout the data, with very few exceptions. Nearly 95% of the possible 442 responses were positive. The opinions appear to be extremely favorable to the existence of the center.

The second research question pertinent to this study is "How do these client groups differ in their opinions of the needs of the Harrison County Teacher Education Center?"

Some of the preceding analysis has already dealt with this question. The Fisher LSD Formula sheds more light on the question. The means have been arranged for each question in tables for easy analysis. The scores are arranged from left to right in ascending order. Any two groups whose score on the question is homogeneous (not significantly different according to the LSD analysis) are connected by a common underline.

Briefly stated, a large percentage of the data is homogeneous. For the 34 questions and 13 groups there were a possible 2652 pairs of groups, each of which could be non-homogeneous. Only 718 combinations were actually significantly different. This means that over 73% of the scores are homogeneous, ie not significantly different.

The high degree of homogeneity becomes even more important when it is coupled with the previously stated high degree of positiveness in almost all the responses. The two factors taken together appear to signify that all groups agree that a center is needed to perform a large number of vital functions.

It is instructive to examine the questions which created the greatest homogeneity, and also those which provoked the least homogeneity. Each question generated 78 pairs of means, each of which could differ by a significant amount.

By this standard a great deal of homogeneity was exhibited. No question compiled more than 36 pairs of significantly different means, which still left 54% of the responses as homogeneous. There were as many as 77 homogeneous pairs on a single question. The average was 57 per question, or 73% homogeneous responses.

The most homogeneous questions occurred as follows:

Question 21: (77) Select cooperating teachers who will accept their student teachers as professional colleagues.

Question 19: (75) Provide cooperating teachers with inservice training designed to enhance competencies to supervise a student teacher.

Question 6: (69) Have parity participation from the state department, school systems and colleges in the financial support of the center in accomplishing its functions.

Question 22: (67) Assist in the development and initiation of new and changing roles of teachers and college personnel in teacher education (such as school-based teacher education coordinators).

Question 34: (65) Encourage the identification of the role of school-based coordinator in schools where a concentrated number of prospective teachers are placed.

Other questions which generated high homogeneity involved holding inservice programs for both college and public school faculty (64), encouraging the interchange of personnel between public schools and colleges (64), coordinating the selection of the most competent cooperating teachers (63), and helping teachers keep abreast of current trends in education.

On the other hand, the least homogeneous questions were revealed as follows:

Question 33: (42) Make available selected teacher education resource materials in those schools which participate in the clinical program.

Question 12: (45) Provide prospective teachers with the opportunity to participate in a wide variety of clinical enrichment experiences in community agencies.

Question 8: (45) Provide the pre-student teacher with a greater variety of public school experience prior to student teaching.

Question 30: (47) Encourage involvement of college personnel who can furnish support and expertise in all areas pertaining to teacher education.

Question 23: (48) Encourage in its inservice program cooperating to use a variety of teaching techniques and strategies.

Other controversial questions concerned augmenting the skills of cooperating teachers through inservice programs (49), helping implement changes in the public schools (50), encouraging colleges to collect and share evaluative data on student teacher success through follow-up surveys (50), and providing experiences to foster personal and professional growth for both student teachers and cooperating teachers.(51).

A more detailed analysis was run on the homogeneity of the four principal client groups, 2,3,12, and 13. These are student teachers, college supervisors, center governance board and supervising teachers respectively.

The four groups showed 204 pairs of means on the 34 questions. Only 57 of these pairs were non-homogeneous, meaning that the groups were homogeneous in pairs over 72% of the time. Ten questions had all pairs homogeneous, while seven more showed only one heterogeneity. Thus 17 (half) of the questions exhibited little or no significant differences.

Even more revealing is the fact that 47 of the 57 significantly different responses involved group three, college supervisors. This group was a part of over 82% of the non-homogeneous pairs. They disagreed with group two 15 times, group 12 17 times and group 13 15 times.

The other three groups exhibited remarkably homogeneous perceptions of the needs of the teacher education center. All three were homogeneous on 26 of the 34 questions, or 72.5% of the questions. A summary of the various combinations reads as follows:

1. Groups 2 and 12: homogeneous on 30 questions (88.2%).
2. Groups 2 and 13: homogeneous on 31 questions (91.2%).
3. Groups 12 and 13: homogeneous on 31 questions (91.2%).

A clear conclusion is that the student teachers, center governance board and supervising teachers were in agreement over 90% of the time when college supervisors are not considered. This has been true of attitudes toward centers by college personnel in general in most research to date.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The major conclusions from these data relative to the two focal research questions have already been stated. Briefly, they reveal that the existence of a center to perform a wide variety of important functions in Harrison County's educational structure elicited a strong, positive reaction from all groups surveyed. Further, there was a strong homogeneity among all groups, indicating unanimity of opinion.

The most notable exception to this pattern was group three, college supervisors. This group was involved in 184 of the 718 significant differences. An average share would have been less than half that number. Group three differed from the other groups by a significant amount 184 of 408 possible times, or 45.1%.

On the other hand the remaining 12 groups differed significantly from each other only 534 of 2244 possible times, or 23.8%. This is barely more than half as often as they differed from group three.

The obvious conclusion is that a center, which is a consortium built on shared decision-making and parity, may well create some concern among college personnel because of its perceived incursion into what they consider their territory. This would seem to deliver a clear message to anyone implementing such a consortium: college personnel need to be carefully recruited and oriented to the non-threatening aspects of participation in a center, along with the resultant benefits.

This conclusion seems to be reinforced by the more positive and more homogeneous results of the other groups. Some of those members were also college personnel, notably on the center governance board. However, they were more involved with and informed about the center than were the supervisors. This may account for the difference in responses.

Like any small, initiatory study, this project needs to be amplified and tested on a larger scale in order to corroborate any findings and conclusions.

Therefore the primary recommendation arising from this study is that a larger, more comprehensive study be done, preferably one involving all seven centers in the state of West Virginia. This type of project should go far toward establishing the true validity of this study and the questions it involved. It should also serve as a unifying agent for the seven centers, showing the commonality of perceptions among all client groups around the state. Since each of the seven centers is unique and wide variations in operational style exist a study such as this might tend to provide a statewide direction for all centers.

APPENDIX A

TABLE OF RANKED MEAN SCORES

1. GROUP 10 7 2 4 9 13 11 8 1 3 5 6 12
MEAN 3.66 3.88 4.10 4.20 4.20 4.35 4.50 4.54 4.57 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00
LSD = 0.65

2. GROUP 3 2 7 10 9 1 11 4 13 6 12 5 8
MEAN 3.00 3.60 3.60 3.66 3.80 4.00 4.12 4.28 4.28 4.40 4.40 4.50 4.54
LSD = 0.77

3. GROUP 7 5 10 11 4 13 8 2 1 6 9 12 3
MEAN 3.50 4.00 4.00 4.12 4.18 4.21 4.45 4.50 4.78 4.80 4.80 4.80 5.00
LSD = 0.75

4. GROUP 10 7 11 5 4 12 8 2 9 1 13 6 3
MEAN 3.33 3.55 3.87 4.00 4.18 4.33 4.36 4.60 4.60 4.64 4.64 4.80 5.00
LSD = 0.87

5. GROUP 5 3 10 6 1 7 2 9 13 11 4 8 12
MEAN 3.00 3.33 3.33 3.60 3.85 4.00 4.10 4.20 4.28 4.31 4.42 4.45 4.60
LSD = 0.91

6. GROUP 3 10 6 9 4 11 2 7 12 13 1 8 5
MEAN 3.66 3.66 3.80 3.80 3.84 3.87 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.14 4.28 4.36 5.00
LSD = 0.92

7. GROUP 9 7 10 11 13 3 2 4 6 1 5 12 8
MEAN 3.40 3.50 3.66 3.68 3.92 4.00 4.20 4.26 4.40 4.50 4.50 4.70 4.72
LSD = 0.76

8. GROUP 5 3 10 11 2 8 13 7 4 1 11 12 6
MEAN 2.00 3.00 3.20 3.33 4.00 4.09 4.21 4.22 4.23 4.42 4.50 4.50 4.80
LSD = 0.90

9.

GROUP	5	10	3	6	9	13	7	4	1	12	8	2	11
MEAN	3.00	3.33	3.66	4.00	4.20	4.21	4.30	4.34	4.50	4.50	4.63	4.80	4.87

LSD = 0.75

10.

GROUP	10	9	4	8	7	1	6	13	12	1	2	3	5
MEAN	3.66	4.20	4.21	4.27	4.30	4.57	4.60	4.78	4.80	4.93	5.00	5.00	5.00

LSD = 0.70

11.

GROUP	9	7	13	1	2	10	11	4	3	6	5	12	11
MEAN	3.00	3.30	3.35	3.42	3.60	3.66	3.87	3.92	4.00	4.20	4.50	4.50	4.63

LSD = 0.94

12.

GROUP	5	9	3	7	11	10	13	2	4	1	6	12	8
MEAN	2.00	2.50	2.66	2.88	3.31	3.33	3.71	3.90	3.92	4.14	4.20	4.30	4.36

LSD = 0.95

13.

GROUP	9	10	3	6	7	4	8	13	5	12	11	2	1
MEAN	2.80	3.33	3.66	4.20	4.20	4.36	4.36	4.42	4.50	4.50	4.56	4.70	4.78

LSD = 0.70

14.

GROUP	5	3	10	9	4	7	11	8	13	1	2	6	12
MEAN	3.00	3.66	3.66	3.80	4.07	4.10	4.25	4.36	4.42	4.57	4.60	4.60	4.70

LSD = 0.70

15.

GROUP	5	10	11	7	13	3	6	4	8	1	12	2	9
MEAN	3.50	4.00	4.18	4.20	4.28	4.33	4.40	4.47	4.54	4.64	4.80	4.90	5.00

LSD = 0.77

16.

GROUP	3	5	10	2	1	7	4	11	8	12	13	6	9
MEAN	2.00	3.50	3.66	4.10	4.21	4.22	4.28	4.31	4.36	4.50	4.64	4.80	5.00

LSD = 0.90

17.

GROUP	3	10	13	4	6	8	7	11	2	9	1	12	5
MEAN	3.00	3.33	3.71	3.72	4.00	4.00	4.10	4.18	4.30	4.40	4.42	4.50	5.00

LSD = 0.91

18. GROUP 3 10 7 13 6 9 4 8 11 12 2 1 5
MEAN 2.33 3.66 3.80 3.85 4.20 4.20 4.23 4.27 4.31 4.50 4.60 4.78 5.00
LSD = 0.83

19. GROUP 7 13 6 10 11 9 4 3 8 1 5 12 2
MEAN 3.70 3.85 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.20 4.31 4.33 4.36 4.50 4.50 4.60 4.80
LSD = 0.83

20. GROUP 10 11 5 6 7 3 13 4 8 2 1 9 12
MEAN 3.66 3.93 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.33 4.35 4.44 4.63 4.70 4.71 4.80 4.80
LSD = 0.78

21. GROUP 10 6 8 4 3 13 11 9 5 7 1 2 12
MEAN 4.00 4.20 4.27 4.31 4.33 4.35 4.37 4.40 4.50 4.50 4.64 4.70 4.90
LSD = 0.81

22. GROUP 2 9 3 10 6 1 7 4 13 8 11 15 5
MEAN 3.40 3.60 3.66 3.66 3.80 3.85 3.90 4.00 4.00 4.18 4.25 4.30 5.00
LSD = 0.80

23. GROUP 3 10 7 6 13 11 4 1 12 2 8 9 5
MEAN 2.33 3.33 3.70 4.00 4.14 4.18 4.26 4.57 4.60 4.70 4.72 4.80 5.00
LSD = 0.81

24. GROUP 3 10 7 11 2 9 5 4 12 8 1 13 6
MEAN 3.00 3.33 3.77 4.25 4.40 4.40 4.50 4.60 4.60 4.63 4.64 4.64 4.80
LSD = 0.77

25. GROUP 3 9 10 7 4 2 1 6 11 13 8 12 5
MEAN 2.66 3.40 3.66 3.90 4.18 4.20 4.35 4.40 4.46 4.50 4.54 4.80 5.00
LSD = 0.77

26. GROUP 3 10 6 13 7 9 1 4 2 11 12 8 5
MEAN 3.33 3.33 4.00 4.14 4.20 4.20 4.28 4.36 4.50 4.50 4.70 4.81 5.00
LSD = 0.78

27.

GROUP	10	7	9	13	1	4	11	3	6	8	2	12	5
MEAN	3.33	3.80	4.00	4.07	4.28	4.31	4.31	4.33	4.40	4.45	4.50	4.70	5.00

LSD = 0.74

28.

GROUP	9	10	1	7	11	2	3	4	8	6	13	12	5
MEAN	2.60	3.33	4.00	4.00	4.06	4.20	4.33	4.36	4.36	4.40	4.42	4.50	5.00

LSD = 0.83

29.

GROUP	10	3	7	9	11	13	1	4	8	2	12	6	5
MEAN	3.33	4.00	4.00	4.20	4.37	4.42	4.50	4.52	4.63	4.70	4.80	4.80	5.00

LSD = 0.74

30.

GROUP	3	10	7	13	4	1	11	12	8	2	6	9	5
MEAN	3.33	3.33	3.60	4.00	4.21	4.42	4.60	4.60	4.63	4.80	4.80	4.80	5.00

LSD = 0.76

31.

GROUP	9	10	7	2	1	13	4	12	3	8	11	6	5
MEAN	3.00	3.33	3.60	4.00	4.07	4.07	4.26	4.30	4.33	4.54	4.56	4.80	5.00

LSD = 0.78

32.

GROUP	3	7	10	9	2	12	13	4	11	1	6	8	5
MEAN	3.00	3.00	3.33	4.00	4.10	4.10	4.14	4.28	4.31	4.35	4.40	4.63	5.00

LSD = 0.88

33.

GROUP	3	5	10	7	9	4	12	2	13	8	1	11	6
MEAN	2.66	3.50	3.66	4.00	4.20	4.36	4.40	4.50	4.50	4.54	4.71	4.75	5.00

LSD = 0.59

34.

GROUP	7	9	3	10	2	13	11	1	4	12	8	6	5
MEAN	3.60	3.60	3.66	3.66	3.80	4.00	4.12	4.21	4.21	4.40	4.45	4.60	5.00

LSD = 0.85

APPENDIX B

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

State of West Virginia
Department of Education
Charleston
25305

DANIEL B. TAYLOR
STATE SUPERINTENDENT
OF SCHOOLS

MEMORANDUM

TO: Selected Persons

FROM: J. Zeb. Wright

SUBJECT: Teacher Education Center Needs Assessment

DATE: March 7, 1975

Great strides have been made in furthering the teacher education center concept in West Virginia. Our State was among the first, if not the first, to create a statewide network of centers. Certainly, our centers are among the few in the nation receiving special funding from a state legislature. Each of the centers is a semi-autonomous consortium of local agencies and institutions cooperatively planning the major thrust of the center. The organization and governance vary among the centers in the State. At this time the centers' staffs and the Department of Education are attempting to define commonalities in all centers and to determine jointly the needs toward which centers will direct their major future efforts.

A number of key words relating to Teacher Education Centers have been identified in the attached "Definition of Terms" at the end of this opinionnaire.

The attached Assessment Model for West Virginia Teacher Education Centers was developed under the leadership of the Department of Education by all the centers' directors. You have been selected to participate in the field testing of the assessment instrument. We ask that you complete the questionnaire within five days and return it in the enclosed self-addressed envelope to:

Dr. Nancy J. Priselac
Director, Harrison County
Student Teaching Center
Harrison County Court House
301 W. Main Street
Clarksburg, West Virginia 26301

JZW/rmv

FIRST FIELD TEST

Needs Assessment for Teacher Education Centers in West Virginia

Listed below are fourteen categories of influential groups from whom we are seeking opinions. Please circle the number in front of the category which best applies to you and fill in the blanks for that category. Then, please rate each of the thirty-four items. Circle the number which corresponds with your perceptions as to "What a teacher education center should be in West Virginia" with respect to various functions and activities that should be involved in a teacher education center.

1. Classroom teacher active in an established Teacher Education Center.

   Subject area_____ Years experience_____

2. Pre-student teacher: College_____ Subject Area_____

3. Student Teacher: College_____ Subject Area_____

   College_____ Subject Area_____

4. College supervisor of student teachers:

   Subject Area_____ Education Department_____

5. County administrators (superintendents, directors, etc.) _____

6. County supervisors/specialists _____

7. College administrators (deans, etc.) _____

8. Elementary School Principal _____

9. Secondary School Principal _____

10. (MUTEC ONLY) School-Based Coordinators _____

11. RESA Director _____

12. County Agency (scouts, county councils, Job Corps, etc.) _____

13. State Department _____

14. Center Directors and Staff _____

THE CENTER SHOULD:

		(high)				(low)
1.	Provide a program of inservice education for cooperating teachers which will augment their skills in working with the teacher education centers.	5	4	3	2	1
2.	Serve as a vehicle to resolve teacher education related problems/concerns between or among college, public school, and state department personnel through discussion and compromise.	5	4	3	2	1
3.	Identify and involve the most competent and qualified cooperating teachers in its teacher education program.	5	4	3	2	1
4.	Facilitate the assignment of student teachers through a planned and coordinated system of recruitment and selection of qualified cooperating teachers.	5	4	3	2	1
5.	Make student teaching assignments which consider such factors as background, training, experiences and other needs of the student teacher.	5	4	3	2	1
6.	Have parity participation from the state department, school systems and colleges in the financial support of the center in accomplishing its functions.	5	4	3	2	1
7.	Help cooperating teachers become more self-analytical and self-critical.	5	4	3	2	1
8.	Provide the pre-student teacher with a greater variety of public school experience prior to student teaching.	5	4	3	2	1
9.	Be so orgainzed as to insure a flow of information and communication among all persons involved in teacher education.	5	4	3	2	1
10.	Should continuously evaluate its program to facilitate desirable change.	5	4	3	2	1
11.	Encourage an interchange of personnel between colleges and public schools such as joint appointments and internships.	5	4	3	2	1
12.	Provide prospective teachers with the opportunity to participate in a wide variety of clinical enrichment experiences in community agencies.	5	4	3	2	1

		(high)				(low)
13.	Provide those experiences that tend to foster personal and professional growth for pre-student teachers, student teachers, and inservice teachers.	5	4	3	2	1
14.	Facilitate participation in those experiences that tend to foster personal and professional growth for preservice and inservice teachers.	5	4	3	2	1
15.	Encourage the cooperating teacher and student teacher to plan, teach and evaluate together as a team.	5	4	3	2	1
16.	Assign student teachers only to those schools where they have the support and cooperation of the school principal.	5	4	3	2	1
17.	Have an organizational structure/governing body that delineates its functions, duties, responsibilities and lines of authority,	5	4	3	2	1
18.	Have adequate representation in its governing body of all parties (schools, colleges, professional organizations, state department, community, student teachers, etc.) concerned with teacher education.	5	4	3	2	1
19.	Provide cooperating teachers with inservice training designed to enhance competencies to supervise a student teacher.	5	4	3	2	1
20.	Promote the concept that the public school is a partner with the colleges in the process of teacher education.	5	4	3	2	1
21.	Select cooperating teachers who will accept their student teachers as professional colleagues.	5	4	3	2	1
22.	Assist in the development and initiation of new and changing roles of teachers and college personnel in teacher education (such as school-based teacher education coordinators.	5	4	3	2	1
23.	Encourage in its inservice program cooperating teachers to use a variety of teaching techniques and strategies.	5	4	3	2	1
24.	Promote mutual trust and confidence between colleges and public schools.	5	4	3	2	1
25.	Encourage colleges to collect and share evaluative data on the success of student teachers by employing appropriate follow-up procedures.	5	4	3	2	1

		(high)				(low
26.	Be provided with the personnel required to perform its prescribed functions.	5	4	3	2	1
27.	Have an inservice program which is cooperatively planned to meet the needs of both public school and college personnel.	5	4	3	2	1
28.	Report to colleges and public schools evidence supporting need for changes in their preparation programs.	5	4	3	2	1
29.	Have inservice programs which help teacher educators keep abreast of current trends in teacher education.	5	4	3	2	1
30.	Encourage involvement of college personnel who can furnish support and expertise in all areas pertaining to teacher education.	5	4	3	2	1
31.	Share with the public school evidence supporting the need for change in their instructional programs.	5	4	3	2	1
32.	Cooperate with the public schools in implementing changes in their instructional programs.	5	4	3	2	1
33.	Make available selected teacher education resource materials in those schools which participate in the clinical program.	5	4	3	2	1
34.	Encourage the identification of the role of school-based coordinator in schools where a concentrated number of prospective teachers are placed.	5	4	3	2	1

In the space below, please add and rank functions or needs not identified above.

35.

36.

37.

38.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Teacher Education Center - a consortium of colleges and/or universities, public school systems and the West Virginia State Department of Education, offering a program designed to improve the quality of teacher education.

School Centers/Center Schools - schools cooperatively identified by colleges and the school system, which are committed to experimentation and innovation in teacher education.

Resource Center for Teacher Education - designated place which houses teacher education materials and media supplied by the teacher education center.

Preservice - the term used to denote the undergraduate teacher education program.

Inservice - the term used to identify credit or noncredit activities (usually presented in the school or district) designed to affect the attitudes, perceptions and/or behaviors of teacher educators while they are successfully employed.

Clinical Experience - one of a number of terms used to describe the many activities of prospective teachers while they are involved in supervised experiences in the field.

Prospective Teacher - candidate of teacher education who studies teaching and will engage in experiences in colleges, schools and/or the community.

Classroom Supervising Teacher/Cooperating Teacher - regularly employed public or private elementary, early childhood or secondary teacher or a representative of a related community agency who works with student teachers and provides observation and supervision of these students.

School-Based Coordinator - an outstanding supervising teacher who has been identified by schools and colleges to coordinate teacher education programs, conduct seminars for prospective teachers and establish an educational resource center in each School Center for teacher education.

College Supervisor - person employed by a college to work with clinical supervising or cooperating teachers and prospective teachers in the field.

Tutor - prospective teacher engaged in a clinical field experience of a purely tutorial nature working one-to-one or with a small group of students in a school setting.

College Aide - prospective teacher in a pre-student teaching clinical field experience which is more comprehensive than that of a tutor.

Community Aide - paraprofessional aide working in a school setting on a volunteer basis as part of an instructional team.

Teacher Education - anyone involved in the preparation and development of teachers.

Parity - implies participation in the teacher education program of the major agencies related to governance, operation and financial support.